



# DESIGN REVIEW BOARD AGENDA

Planning & Environmental Services  
130 Cremona Drive, Suite B, Goleta, CA 93117  
(805)961-7500

---

## REGULAR MEETING

Tuesday, July 13, 2010

### CONSENT CALENDAR

Chair's Designee and Planning Staff

### SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE – 2:30 P.M.

Members: Scott Branch, Carl Schneider, Thomas Smith

### STREET TREE SUBCOMMITTEE – 2:00 P.M.

Members: Simon Herrera, Chris Messner, Bob Wignot

### ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA – 3:00 P.M.

### REGULAR AGENDA – 3:15 P.M.

**GOLETA CITY HALL – COUNCIL CHAMBERS  
130 CREMONA DRIVE, SUITE B, GOLETA, CALIFORNIA**

#### Members:

Cecilia Brown (At-Large Member), Chair  
Simon Herrera (Landscape Contractor), Vice  
Chair  
Scott Branch (Architect)

Chris Messner (Landscape Contractor)  
Carl Schneider (Architect)  
Thomas Smith (At-Large Member)  
Bob Wignot (At-Large Member)

---

#### Notices:

- Requests for review of project plans or change of scheduling should be made to the City of Goleta, 130 Cremona Drive, Suite B, Goleta, California, 93117; Telephone (805)961-7500.
  - In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the City of Goleta at (805)961-7500. Notification at least 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable the City staff to make reasonable arrangements.
  - Preliminary approval or denial of a project by the Design Review Board may be appealed to the Goleta Planning Commission within ten (10) calendar days following the action. Please contact the Planning & Environmental Services Department for more information.
  - Design Review Board approvals do not constitute Land Use Clearances.
  - The square footage figures on this agenda are subject to change during the review process.
  - The length of Agenda items is only an estimate. Applicants are responsible for being available when their item is to be heard. Any item for which the applicant is not immediately available may be continued to the next meeting.
-

## Design Review Board Agenda

July 13, 2010

Page 2 of 18

### A. CALL MEETING TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

### B. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

#### B-1. MEETING MINUTES

A. Design Review Board Minutes for June 22, 2010

#### B-2. STREET TREE SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

#### B-3. PLANNING DIRECTOR REPORT

C. **PUBLIC COMMENT:** General comments regarding topics over which the Design Review Board has discretion will be allowed. Comments from concerned parties regarding specific projects not on today's agenda will be limited to three minutes per person.

D. **REVIEW OF AGENDA & PROJECTED AGENDA:** A brief review of the agenda for requests for continuance and scheduled projects on the next agenda.

### E. CONSENT CALENDAR SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

### F. CONSENT CALENDAR

- NONE

### G. SIGN SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

### H. SIGN CALENDAR

#### H-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 10-068-DRB

5960 Calle Real (APN 069-110-033)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary/Final* review. The property includes an existing fuel station and convenience store on a 16,117-square foot lot in the Commercial Highway zone district. The applicant proposes to re-face the top portion of the existing pole sign with a new vacuum formed plex face. The top portion to be re-faced measures 2.17-feet by 2.17-feet for an aggregate of approximately 38 square feet. The sign will read 'WORLD' with letters measuring 12" high, and a globe logo below the text. The lower portion of the pole sign including the fuel prices and signs advertising the 'Food Mart', and 'Diesel' will be unchanged. The applicant also proposes to install two internally illuminated individually mounted channel letter canopy signs that read 'WORLD' in red text, one on the west elevation, and one on the south elevation, both measuring 1.5-feet high by 7.8-feet long for an aggregate of approximately 12 square feet. The proposed background color for the canopy is beige. The project was filed by agent Yessica Sanchez of Promotion Plus Sign Co Inc. on behalf of Joe Partida of World

## Design Review Board Agenda

July 13, 2010

Page 3 of 18

Oil, property owner. Related cases: 10-068-SCC; 10-069-SCC; 10-070-SCC.  
(Brian Hiefield)

### **H-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 10-071-DRB**

5648 Hollister Avenue (APN 071-082-006)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary/Final* review. The property includes an existing fuel station and convenience store on a 13,503-square foot lot in the C-2 zone district. The applicant proposes to re-face the existing pole sign with a new vacuum formed plex face measuring 12-feet high by 8.2-feet wide for an aggregate of approximately 98 square feet. The total height of the pole sign would remain 21.75-feet tall. The sign will have the circular Unocal 76 logo measuring 3' high on the top portion of the sign, and the prices on the lower portion with numbers measuring 1.25' high. The applicant also proposes to install two internally illuminated circular Unocal 76 logos on the existing canopy measuring 2.75-feet high, one on the north elevation, and one on the south elevation, each totaling approximately 8 square feet. The project was filed by agent Yessica Sanchez of Promotion Plus Sign Co Inc. on behalf of Joe Partida of World Oil, property owner. Related cases: 10-068-SCC; 10-069-SCC; 10-070-SCC. (Brian Hiefield)

### **H-3. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 10-091-DRB**

420 South Fairview (APN 071-130-061)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary/Final* review. The property includes a 73,203-square foot commercial building on a 4.93-acre parcel in the M-RP zone district. The applicant proposes to place one wall sign on the western façade of the building facing Fairview Avenue. The wall sign will read "Tecolote Research Inc." on two lines of text. The sign would be 36 inches tall by 192 inches wide and have an area of 48 square feet. The sign would be constructed of 0.5-inch thick cast aluminum letters painted dark bronze (Frazee 8716N "Western Reserve") that would be pin-mounted on the façade. No lighting is proposed. The project was filed by Ron Wilkinson of Vogue Sign Company, agent, on behalf of Tecolote Research Inc., tenant, and The Towbes Group, property owner. Related cases: 10-091-SCC. (Shine Ling)

## **I. REVISED FINAL CALENDAR**

- NONE

## **J. FINAL CALENDAR**

### **J-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 08-090-DRB**

7837 Langlo Ranch Road (APN 079-600-030)

This is a request for *Final* review. The property includes a 3,086-square foot two-story residence and an attached 446-square foot 2-car garage on a 7,533-square foot lot in the DR-4 zone district. The applicant proposes to construct 174-square feet in additions on the first-floor, consisting of a 44-square foot bathroom, a 24-square foot living room, 53-square foot garage, and a 53-square foot attached utility shed. The applicant also proposes to convert 133 square feet of the existing

## Design Review Board Agenda

July 13, 2010

Page 4 of 18

garage into habitable square footage for a bathroom and laundry room. The resulting 2-story structure would be 3,260 square feet, consisting of a 2,814-square foot single-family dwelling and an attached 446-square foot 2-car garage. This proposed project exceeds the maximum allowable Floor Area Ratio Guidelines (FAR) for this property, which is 2,313.25 square feet plus an allocation of 440 square feet for a 2-car garage. All materials used for this project are to match the existing residence. The project was filed by agent Lawrence Thompson on behalf of James Kirwan III, property owner. Related cases: 89-V-028 J; 90-LUS-136; 08-090-LUP; 09-053-APP. (Continued from 9-23-08\*, 9-9-08, 8-12-08) (Brian Hiefield)

*Comments from prior DRB meeting:*

### **9-9-08 Meeting (Approved Minutes):**

1. Member Branch commented: a) achieving the 20-foot depth in the garage makes the plans work; b) the impacts to the neighborhood have already occurred with regard to the project's current size, bulk and scale, and the intensity of use; and c) the overall project is relatively minor and simple.
2. Member Schneider commented: a) agreed with Member Branch that the neighborhood impacts have already occurred; b) the extra square footage for the proposed storage shed may not be needed considering the number of bedrooms and study area; and c) there needs to be room for a water heater.
3. Member Brown commented: a) agreed with comments made by Members Branch and Schneider.
4. Chair Wignot commented: a) the issues raised by neighbors at the last meeting related mostly to the number of vehicles associated with the property, and that vehicles are not being parked in the garage; b) given the number of bedrooms, it seems reasonable to add the number of bathrooms; and c) noted that the addition of a bathroom in proximity to the garage the garage may invite the potential for an unpermitted unit, but he does not believe this concern is within the DRB's mandate.

**MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Branch and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Absent: Herrera, Smith) to grant Preliminary Approval of Item L-4, No. 08-090-DRB, 7837 Langlo Ranch Road, as submitted, with the following comment: 1) the proposed storage shed on the west side yard shall be reduced in size to be big enough only to encompass the water heater; and to continue to September 23, 2008, for Final review on the Consent Calendar.**

### **J-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-189-DRB**

5632 Cielo Avenue (APN 069-080-009)

This is a request for *Final* review. The property is an undeveloped 1.01-acre parcel 20-R-1 zone district. The applicant proposes to construct 3,150-square foot single-story residence with an additional 1,088-square foot 3-car garage, 154-square foot breezeway and 258 feet of porches. The resulting single-story structure would be 4,392 square feet, consisting of a 3,150-square foot single-family dwelling and an attached (via 154-square foot breezeway) 1,088-square foot 3-car garage. This proposal is within the maximum floor area ratio guidelines for this property, which is 4,379 square feet plus an allocation of 650 square feet for a 3-car garage. New materials consist of stucco siding painted "X-53 Pure Ivory

\* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

## Design Review Board Agenda

July 13, 2010

Page 5 of 18

(Base 100),” a wood front door with a natural stain, Loewen wood windows painted “Sage Green,” and a red barrel tiled roof. The project was filed by agent Preston Mann of Mann Construction on behalf of Lindsay and Lesa Mann, property owner. This property was formerly addressed 811 Cambridge Drive. Related cases: 09-183-CC, 09-189-LUP. (Continued from 6-8-10, 5-25-10\*, 5-11-10\*, 4-27-10\*, 4-13-10\*, 3-23-10\*, 3-9-10, 2-9-10) (Scott Kolwitz)

*Comments from prior DRB meeting:*

### **6-8-10 Meeting (Approved Minutes):**

1. Member Branch commented: a) Although drainage is not within the purview of the DRB, in his opinion, now may be the time to work with a consensus of the other neighbors to see if it is possible to help mitigate drainage in the event of a larger storm, which he believes is worth exploring in the spirit of neighborhood compatibility; b) The applicant has addressed most of the criteria as requested by the DRB; c) The height and architecture of the retaining walls are appropriate; d) The proposed house is located appropriately on site; e) The applicant has lowered some of the plate heights; f) He is comfortable with the proposed architectural plans at this point in the review; g) The dimensions on the drawings need to accurately reflect the architectural details, including the lower plate heights; and h) Changing the color of the windows from green to brown is appreciated.
2. Member Wignot commented: a) The applicant has responded to the DRB comments from the previous review very completely; b) There are documentations on file that indicate the City Arborist agrees with the Arborist Report, and also that the proposed plans for the hammerhead turnaround are acceptable by the Fire Department; c) He believes that there are some questions about the grading plan, and that some further study of alternatives is appropriate at this time, although it is not within the purview of the DRB; d) He questioned whether it would be possible to drain the water to the private driveway instead of adjacent properties; and e) The project is moving in a good direction.
3. Member Schneider commented: a) He supports the proposed plans for the aesthetic and architectural details; b) The gravel dissipaters should be coordinated with the landscape plan; and c) He encouraged the applicant to study and evaluate oversizing the drywells to try to accommodate more water than the minimum City requirement, which would be a way to improve the drainage over and above what currently exists.
4. Member Smith commented: a) He supports the proposed aesthetic, landscaping and architectural details; and b) In his opinion, although it is not within the purview of the DRB, he encouraged the applicant to explore the speaker’s suggestion to install a drain to address concerns with regard to runoff in the event of a larger storm.
5. Member Herrera commented: a) Expressed concern regarding runoff onto the neighbors’ property if the system is only prepared for one inch of rain; b) From his experience with regard to clay soil, he believes runoff will occur; and c) He suggested that adding a drain that would carry water away from the neighbors’ property would probably help.
6. Chair Brown commented: a) It is important to reflect in the minutes that there are comments from the DRB expressing concern with regard to the runoff and encouraging that steps be taken to improve the overall situation, and possibly capture more water on site, although it may not be within the DRB’s purview; b)

\* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

## Design Review Board Agenda

July 13, 2010

Page 6 of 18

Her main concern is with regard to runoff; and c) She supports the favorable DRB comments with regard to the aesthetic portion of the project.

**MOTION: Smith moved, seconded by Branch, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote, to grant Preliminary Approval of Item L-1, DRB Permit No. 09-189-DRB, 5632 Cielo Avenue, as submitted, with the following condition: 1) The applicant shall submit plans for Final review that accurately reflect the plate height revisions as stated by the applicant in their presentation; and to continue Item L-1, DRB Permit No. 09-189-DRB, to July 13, 2010, for Final review on the Final Calendar.**

### K. PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

#### K-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-154-DRB

7402 Hollister Avenue (APN 079-210-064)

This is a request for *Preliminary* review. The property includes the Hollister Business Park (HBP), which contains 8 buildings totaling 292,130 square feet on 24.427 gross acres in the M-RP zone district. On the eastern parcel of the HBP the applicant proposes to construct a wireless communications facility along the eastern property line. A 50-foot tall monopine would be constructed to support 8 antennae. The service area would occupy 623 square feet and would include the monopine structure and associated equipment cabinets. 3 parking spaces would be displaced by the facility, which would be replaced with 2 new parking spaces created by filling in an existing landscape well immediately to the south of the facility lease area. The project was filed by Scott Dunaway of SureSite Consulting Group, LLC, agent, on behalf of T-Mobile USA, Inc., lessee, and Hollister Business Park LLC, property owner. Related cases: 09-154-CUP. (Continued from 1-26-10, 12-8-09, 11-10-09) (Shine Ling)

*Comments from prior DRB meeting:*

#### 1-26-10 Meeting (Approved Minutes):

Comments:

1. Vice Chair Brown commented: a) The branches should to be staggered so they are not opposite one another.
2. Member Messner commented: a) The design would be fine if the branches are staggered off the trunk.

**MOTION: Schneider moved, seconded by Branch, and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Absent: Herrera, Smith) to take off calendar Item M-2, DRB Permit No. 09-154-DRB, 7402 Hollister Avenue, with the following Conceptual comments: 1) The branches shall be offset and staggered as they project from the trunk; and 2) The revised design showing the branches offset and staggered as they project from the trunk shall be included in the plans that move forward in the review process for the proposed project.**

#### K-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 10-051-DRB

Various locations throughout the City public rights-of-way

This is a request for *Preliminary* review. The proposed project involves the modification of three existing nodes and the addition of two new nodes to the

## Design Review Board Agenda

July 13, 2010

Page 7 of 18

existing NextG Networks radiofrequency transport service system within City rights-of-way (ROWs) and utility easements over various public and private properties city-wide. The three existing nodes are located at the following intersections: (1) Cathedral Oaks Rd./Winchester Canyon Rd.; (2) Phelps Rd./Pacific Oaks Rd; and (3) Cathedral Oaks Rd./Los Carneros Rd. The two new nodes are located at: (1) Hollister Ave./Patterson Ave.; (2) Cambridge Dr./Cathedral Oaks Rd.

Each node would include an omnidirectional antenna and supporting equipment cabinet below the antenna mounted on an existing utility pole, traffic signal, or street light. Each node would be connected by fiber-optic cable installed either on existing utility poles, in joint conduit, or through shallow trenching within City streets. Support equipment for each node would be installed at a minimum height above existing grade of nine (9) feet, in an above-ground equipment cabinet, or underground. All antennae and supporting equipment would be non-reflective in color and materials. The electrical power supply for each node would be provided from existing utility lines installed on either existing utility poles or in joint conduit. No new utility poles for the supply of electrical power to any of the nodes are proposed. The project was filed by HP Communications, agent, on behalf of NextG Networks, applicant. Related cases: 10-051-CUPAM. (Continued from 6-22-10) (Shine Ling)

*Comments from prior DRB meeting:*

### **6-22-10 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):**

**By consensus, the DRB supported the design of the two new nodes, GOLN011 and GOLN042, and recommended that all of the equipment attached to the pole, with the exception of the antenna, shall be painted the same color as the pole, for aesthetic purposes, with regard to Item M-3, DRB Permit No. 10-051-DRB. (Ayes: Branch, Brown, Messner, Smith, and Wignot. Noes: None. Absent: Herrera, Schneider).**

**MOTION: Wignot moved, seconded by Smith, and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Absent: Herrera, Schneider) that the above-ground mounted utility boxes for SCE equipment are not acceptable and recommend that telecommunications facilities shall be undergrounded, if feasible, to reduce visual impacts, with regard to Node GOLN002 and Node GOLN012, Item M-3, DRB Permit No. 10-051-DRB.**

**MOTION: Wignot moved, seconded by Branch, and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Absent: Herrera, Schneider) to support the proposed design and relocation of Node GOLN001 from a power pole to a proposed traffic signal at Cathedral Oaks/Winchester Canyon Road; and to recommend that the pole and any appurtenances that connect to the pole shall be painted the same color as the current pole, with the exception of the antenna, and that a power cabinet, if needed, shall be undergrounded, with regard to Item M-3, DRB Permit No. 10-051-DRB.**

## Design Review Board Agenda

July 13, 2010

Page 8 of 18

**MOTION:** Brown moved, seconded by Branch, and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Absent Herrera, Schneider) to recommend to the Director of Planning and Environmental Services, with regard to Item M-3, DRB Permit No. 10-051-DRB, that the conduit from the power box to the antenna on the NextG Networks nodes that were approved on October 27, 2009, shall be painted the same color as the pole for aesthetic purposes, if the NextG Networks has jurisdiction to paint the whole conduit.

By consensus, the DRB continued Item M-3, DRB Permit No. 10-051-DRB, various locations throughout the City public rights-of-way, to July 13, 2010. (Ayes: Branch, Brown, Messner, Smith, and Wignot. Noes: None. Absent: Herrera, Schneider).

### L. CONCEPTUAL/PRELIMINARY CALENDAR

#### L-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 10-081-DRB

5651-5739 Encina Road (APN 069-110-074)

This is a request for *Conceptual/Preliminary* review. The property includes an 83 unit apartment complex including a 951-square foot clubhouse, and a pool on a 4.4 acre parcel in the DR-16 zone district. The applicant proposes to construct a 704-square foot addition to the clubhouse to house an exercise room and restroom facilities. The applicant also proposes to construct a 170-square foot detached trellis structure adjacent to a new BBQ area directly to the south of the clubhouse. The project was filed by agent Natalie Cope of CSA Architects on behalf of The Towbes Group, property owner. Related cases: 71-RZ-31; 72-M-66; 10-081-SCD; 10-081-LUP. (Brian Hiefield)

### M. CONCEPTUAL CALENDAR

#### M-1. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-140-DRB

6830 Cortona Drive (APN 073-140-016)

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The property is undeveloped and consists of 8.86 acres within the Inland Area of the City zoned DR-20. The applicant proposes to develop a 171-rental apartment unit project. The 171 proposed apartments would be comprised of a mix of one, two, and three bedroom units (63 1-bedroom, 96 2-bedrooms, and 12 3-bedrooms) contained within seven two-story buildings (12 to 16 units each) and one three-story building (75 units) with a total residential square footage of 165,843 square feet. Amenities would include a 2,491-square foot communal recreation building, a 1,125-square foot swimming pool/spa (measuring 25 x 45 feet), a 672-square foot maintenance building, 322 parking spaces (in carports and open areas) and drive aisles, landscaping, exterior lighting, and an internal system of pedestrian pathways. Access to the project would be provided via a 60-foot driveway onto Cortona Drive. Project grading would involve 5,700-cubic yards of cut and 8,500-cubic yards of fill (net import of 2,800-cubic yards of fill). The project also includes a request to modify the rear and side yard setbacks to allow for the location of carports on the rear (0-setback) property line and within five (5) feet of the side



## Design Review Board Agenda

July 13, 2010

Page 9 of 18

property line. Water and sewer would be provided by the Goleta Water District and Goleta West Sanitary District. The project was filed by Harwood White, agent on behalf of Cortona Corner LP, property owner. Related cases: 09-140-DP. (Continued from 6-22-10) (Alan Hanson)

*Comments from prior DRB meeting:*

### **6-22-10 Meeting (Unapproved Minutes):**

**MOTION:** Brown moved, seconded by Branch, and carried by a 5 to 0 vote (Absent: Herrera; Recused: Schneider) to continue Item M-1, DRB Permit No. 09-140-DRB, 6830 Cortona Drive, to July 13, 2010, with the following comments:

1. Consider adding some 3-stories to some of the 2-story buildings, and changing a portion of the 3-story building to two-stories, with a goal to meet setback requirements;
2. Study elevator locations for 3-story buildings;
3. Study privacy concerns;
4. Provide more photo simulations and/or renderings;
5. Restudy the parking plan to save more skyline trees;
6. Study the installation of photovoltaics on the building and carport roofs;
7. Study the open space amenities and their proposed locations;
8. Provide an open space map that demonstrates compliance with the zone district's 40% common open space requirement;
9. Correct and restudy the landscape plan;
10. Study perimeter fencing options to potentially address security concerns of adjoining property owners and present detailed plans for those options deemed most viable;
11. Provide plans showing the location of utility boxes and appropriate landscaping;
12. Additionally, the majority of DRB members supported the request to modify the setbacks.

**Chair Brown was unable to make Finding 6.12.**

**Member Wignot was unable to make Finding 6.01 or Finding 6.03.**

**Member Wignot was unable to find that there is justification to modify the setbacks.**

### **M-2. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 09-174-DRB**

5484 Overpass Road (APN 071-220-033)

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The property includes a 5,780-square foot shop building, a 1,362-square foot office building, a 18,835-square foot unenclosed materials storage area, a 640-square foot storage unit, and two unused fuel pumps and associated underground fuel tanks on a 84,070-square foot lot in the M-1 zone district. The applicant proposes to construct a wireless communications facility 10 feet from the northern property line in the rear yard. A 70-foot tall monopine would be constructed to support 9 antennae. The service area would occupy 1,000 square feet and would include the monopine structure, associated equipment cabinets, and an emergency generator. The facility would

## Design Review Board Agenda

July 13, 2010

Page 10 of 18

connect to a power/telephone pole adjacent to the lease site. Access to the site is via an existing access road to the construction yard. The project was filed by Jay Higgins of SAC Wireless, agent, on behalf of Verizon Wireless, lessee, and Randy and Susan Douglas, property owners. Related cases: 09-174-CUP. (Continued from 6-22-10\*, 6-8-10\*, 5-25-10, 5-11-10, 4-27-10) (Shine Ling)

*Comments from prior DRB meeting:*

### **5-25-10 Meeting (Approved Minutes):**

1. Member Wignot commented: a) Suggested the applicant consider the possibility of volunteering to plant additional live pine trees amongst the existing eucalyptus trees on the site and/or on the Caltrans right-of-way; b) The site is being camouflaged very well and the revised plans are an improvement over the plans that were presented previously; c) He acknowledged that most persons traveling along Highway 217 are not focused on individual trees but more on the road ahead; d) He questioned whether locating the wireless facility on the Caltrans right-of-way was an option; and e) There is a tall pine tree on the corner of Malva Avenue and Vega Drive that has had three or four new branches grow back after approximately 7-8 feet at the top were blown off during a wind storm. He stated that the tree now resembles the shape of the proposed monopine design, noting that the shape does exist in nature, although a rarity.
2. Chair Brown commented: a) The revised design is an improvement, although it does not emulate a pine tree very well; b) In Photo Simulation 1, the shape of the monopine still needs to be more conical, rather than bulging around the middle; c) Requested that the applicant refer to the form of the pine tree that is shown at the very right edge of the picture in Photo Simulation 3, as a template for the shape of the monopine, and consider that the branches appear to be somewhat uneven; d) Designs that do not fit in with their surroundings are noticeable; e) The concern is how to best disguise the faux monopine in the landscape; f) The applicant is requested to explain the method that will be used to assemble and install the monopine; and g) Her concerns are aesthetic, not functional, with regard to whether there is a service overlap and the possibility for selecting another site.
3. Member Schneider commented: a) The revised plans are definitely an improvement; b) He supports selecting a color for the monopine that ties in with the eucalyptus trees from the standpoint that the typical pine tree color would stand out; c) The drawings should define the height of the lowest branches, which would probably start at the 20-foot level; and d) With regard to the comment by speaker Gary Vandeman, a simple straight pole may be appropriate in certain situations, but he believes that monopine design would be better for this site than a straight pole because it would need to have antennas mounted on top that project out approximately 3-4 feet for technology purposes.
4. Member Branch commented: a) A huge improvement has been made to the plans that were presented at the previous meeting; b) Because of the number of antennas and the height of the monopine, it may not be possible to achieve a pure conical shape without becoming too symmetrical; however, he respects Chair Brown's support for a more conical design; c) From his review of Photo Simulation 1, the monopine seems to fit in well enough that he does not believe it would be a distraction for him when driving on Highway 217; d) Probably most people driving along the highway won't be paying that much attention to the

\* Indicates request for continuance to a future date.

## Design Review Board Agenda

July 13, 2010

Page 11 of 18

- monopine; and e) At this point in the review process, it is time for the photo simulations and plans to reflect the applicant's response to the DRB comments.
5. Member Smith commented: a) The design should be more of a natural, conical shape; b) A monopine design with a conical shape would be applicable also for the applicant's other sites; c) The proposed location and colors are fine so far; d) The plans should now reflect the proposed revisions in response to the DRB comments; e) He does not believe there needs to be any other conifer species surrounding the monopine because, historically, some of the ranches in Goleta have imported specimen trees and it is not unusual to see conifers planted in the middle of these other species; and f) Planting more conifers at the site may call attention to the faux monopine design.
  6. Vice Chair Herrera commented: a) In his opinion, the monopine would look more natural if it was the color of a Star Pine tree, which it resembles, rather than the color of a eucalyptus tree, because it would look odd to persons who know about trees; b) In Photo Simulation 2, there is a gap between the top of the bridge and the lower branches that needs to be corrected on the plans so the trunk is not visible from the highway; and c) The view of the monopine from Photo Simulation 1 is a great improvement, and it would look good if the same shape would be visible when looking at the tree in every direction.

**MOTION: Brown moved, seconded by Schneider, and carried by a 7 to 0 vote, to direct the applicant to respond to the Conceptual comments and to present new photo simulations and drawings that represent the revised proposal in terms of branch length, branch staggering, branch density, branch placement, minimum height of the bottom branches, and colors within the context of the existing trees; and to continue Item M-2, Permit No. 09-174-DRB, 5484 Overpass Road, to June 8, 2010.**

### **M-3. DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PERMIT NO. 10-043-DRB**

1-71 South Los Carneros Road (APN 073-330-024; -026; -027; -028; -029)

This is a request for *Conceptual* review. The property is undeveloped and consists of 43.14 acres within the Inland Area of the City zoned PRD-275. The applicant proposes to develop a 428 unit residential project on the property.

The 428 units would be comprised of a mix of 119 townhome units, 109 units in either a tri or four-plex configuration, 56 detached single family units, 74 market rate apartments, and 70 affordable apartment units in two phases on Lots 2,4,5,6, and 7 of TM 14,500. The multifamily housing would consist of 44 1-bedroom/studio apartments, 156 2-bedroom apartments, 172 3-bedroom or more apartments. Recreational amenities are proposed including a public bike trail across the property connecting Los Carneros Road to Cortona Drive via a bridge over Tecolotito Creek, 0.89 acre community recreation center with a communal recreation building, pools (2), spa, and tot-lot/open play area for project residents, as well as a 4.82 acre neighborhood park accessible to the general public. The project includes landscaping, utilities, street and exterior building lighting, and on-street and off-street surface parking with additional garage parking for certain unit types for a total of 1,055 parking spaces.

Access to the project would be provided by a full movement, signalized intersection at Los Carneros/Calle Koral, a right-in/right-out only intersection at

## **Design Review Board Agenda**

July 13, 2010

Page 12 of 18

Los Carneros Road just east of the Los Carneros/Tecolotito Creek Bridge, and a connection to Cortona Drive via a bridge across Tecolotito Creek.

Project grading would involve 62,000 cubic yards of cut and 67,500-cubic yards of fill (net import of 5,500-cubic yards of fill). Drainage improvements consist of a system of 25 small bio retention areas and stormdrains connecting to two, 5,000+ square-foot underground detention basins that discharge into Tecolotito Creek via connections to two existing stormdrains in the eastern creek bank, one immediately north of the Los Carneros/Tecolotito Creek bridge and the other just north of the proposed bridge across Tecolotito Creek that would connect to Cortona Drive on the west side of the creek.

Water and sewer would be provided by the Goleta Water District and Goleta West Sanitary District.

The project was filed by Tiffany Sukay, agent on behalf of Comstock Homes, property owner. Related cases: 10-043-GPA, RZ, OA, SPA, TM, DP/10-044-DP. (Alan Hanson)

### **N. ADVISORY CALENDAR**

- **NONE**

### **O. DISCUSSION ITEMS**

#### **O-1. REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS BY MEMBERS**

#### **O-2. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY MEMBERS**

### **P. ADJOURNMENT**

## **Design Review Board Abridged Bylaws and Guidelines**

### **Purpose (Design Review Board Bylaws, 1.1)**

The purpose of the City Design Review Board (DRB) is to encourage development that exemplifies the best professional design practices so as to enhance the visual quality of the environment, benefit surrounding property values, and prevent poor quality of design.

### **Authority (Design Review Board Bylaws, 1.2)**

The Goleta City Council established the DRB and DRB Bylaws in March of 2002 (Ordinance No. 02-14 as amended by Ordinance No. 02-26). DRB Bylaws have subsequently been amended through Resolutions 02-69, 04-03, 05-27, 07-22 & 09-04. The DRB currently operates under Bylaws from Resolution 09-04

## **Design Review Board Procedures**

### **Goals (Design Review Board Bylaws, 1.3)**

The DRB is guided by a set of general goals that define the major concerns and objectives of its review process. These goals are to:

- 1) ensure that development and building design is consistent with adopted community design standards (e.g. General Plan, Goleta Old Town Heritage District Architectural and Design Guidelines, Design Standards for Commercial Projects);
- 2) promote high standards in architectural design and the construction of aesthetically pleasing, architecturally correct, structures so that new development does not detract from existing neighborhood characteristics;
- 3) encourage the most appropriate use of land;
- 4) promote visual interest throughout the City through the preservation of public scenic, ocean and mountain vistas, creation of open space areas, and providing for a variety of architectural styles;
- 5) preserve creek areas through restoration and enhancement, discourage the removal of significant trees and foliage;
- 6) ensure neighborhood compatibility of all projects;
- 7) ensure that architecture will respect the privacy of neighbors and is considerate of private views and solar access;
- 8) ensure that grading and development are appropriate to the site and that long term visible scarring of the landscape is avoided where possible;
- 9) preserve and protect native and biologically and aesthetically valuable nonnative vegetation or to ensure adequate and appropriate replacement for vegetation loss;
- 10) ensure that the continued health, safety and welfare of the neighborhood are not compromised;
- 11) provide for adequate street design and sufficient parking for residents and guests in a safe and aesthetically pleasing way;
- 12) ensure that construction is in appropriate proportion to lot size;
- 13) encourage energy efficiency; and
- 14) ensure that air circulation between structures is not impaired and shading is minimized on adjacent properties.

## **Design Review Board Agenda**

July 13, 2010

Page 14 of 18

### **Aspects Considered in Review (Design Review Board Bylaws, 6.1)**

The DRB shall review each project for conformity with the purpose of this Chapter, the applicable comprehensive plan policies and guidelines, including without limitation, the Goleta Old Town Heritage District Architecture and Design Guidelines, the Highway 101 Corridor Design Guidelines, the Goleta Architecture and Design Standards for Commercial Projects, and the applicable City sign and zoning regulations. The DRB's review shall include:

- 1) Height, bulk, scale and area coverage of buildings and structures and other site improvements.
- 2) Colors and types of building materials and application.
- 3) Physical and design relation with existing and proposed structures on the same site and in the immediately affected surrounding area.
- 4) Site layout, orientation, and location of buildings, and relationship with open areas and topography.
- 5) Height, materials, colors, and variations in boundary walls, fences, or screen planting.
- 6) Location and type of existing and proposed landscaping.
- 7) Sign design and exterior lighting.

### **Findings (Design Review Board Bylaws, 6.2)**

In approving, approving with conditions, or denying an application, the DRB shall examine the materials submitted with the application and any other material provided to Planning and Environmental Services to determine whether the buildings, structures, or signs are appropriate and of good design in relation to other buildings, structures, or signs on the site and in the immediately affected surrounding area. Such determination shall be based upon the following findings, as well as any additional findings required pursuant to any applicable comprehensive plan policies and guidelines, including without limitation, the Goleta Old Town Heritage District Architecture and Design Guidelines, the Highway 101 Corridor Design Guidelines, the Goleta Architecture and Design Standards for Commercial Projects and the applicable City sign and zoning regulations:

- 1) The development will be compatible with the neighborhood, and its size, bulk and scale will be appropriate to the site and the neighborhood.
- 2) Site layout, orientation, and location of structures, buildings, and signs are in an appropriate and well-designated relationship to one another, and to the environmental qualities, open spaces and topography of the property.
- 3) The project demonstrates a harmonious relationship with existing and proposed adjoining developments, avoiding excessive variety and monotonous repetition, but allowing similarity of style, if warranted.
- 4) There is harmony of material, color, and composition of all sides of a structure or buildings.
- 5) A limited number of materials will be on the exterior face of the building or structure.
- 6) There is consistency and unity of composition and treatment of exterior elevation.
- 7) Mechanical and electrical equipment is well integrated in the total design concept and screened from public view to the maximum extent practicable.
- 8) All visible onsite utility services are appropriate in size and location.
- 9) The grading will be appropriate to the site.
- 10) Adequate landscaping is provided in proportion to the project and the site with due regard to the preservation of specimen and landmark trees, and existing native vegetation.
- 11) The selection of plant materials is appropriate to the project and its environment, and adequate provision will be made for the long-term maintenance of such plant materials.
- 12) The project will preserve and protect, to the maximum extent practicable, any mature, specimen or skyline tree, or appropriately mitigate the loss.

## Design Review Board Agenda

July 13, 2010

Page 15 of 18

- 13) The development will not adversely affect significant public scenic views.
- 14) Signs, including their lighting, are well designed and are appropriate in size and location.
- 15) All exterior site, structure and building lighting is well-designed and appropriate in size and location.
- 16) The proposed development is consistent with any additional design standards as expressly adopted by the City Council.
- 17) The development will enhance the appearance of the neighborhood.
- 18) The public health, safety and welfare will be protected.
- 19) The project architecture will respect the privacy of neighbors and is considerate of private views and solar access.
- 20) The project will provide for adequate street design and sufficient parking for residents and guests in a safe and aesthetically pleasing way.

### Levels of Review (Design Review Board Bylaws, 5.1)

#### Conceptual Review

Conceptual review is a required step that allows the applicant and the DRB to participate in an informal discussion about the proposed project. Applicants are encouraged to initiate this review as early in the design process as possible. This level of review is intended to provide the applicant with good direction early in the process to avoid spending unnecessary time and money by developing a design concept that may be inconsistent with the City's architectural guidelines and development standards. When a project is scheduled for conceptual review, the DRB may grant preliminary approval if the required information is provided, the design and details are acceptable and the project is properly noticed for such dual approval.

Information required for conceptual review includes:

- a. Photographs which show the site from 3 to 5 vantage points or a panorama from the site and of the site as seen from the street, and photographs of the surrounding neighborhood showing the relationship of the site to such adjacent properties. Aerial photographs are helpful if available and may be required at later stages.
- b. Site plan showing vicinity map, topography, location of existing and proposed structures and driveways, and locations of all structures adjacent to the proposed structure. The site plan shall also indicate any proposed grading, an estimate of the amount of such grading, and any existing vegetation to be removed or retained.
- c. Site statistics including all proposed structures, square footage by use, and the number of covered and uncovered parking spaces.
- d. Schematics of the proposed project shall include rough floor plans and at least two elevations indicating the height of proposed structures. Perspective sketches of the project may also be required. Proposed materials and colors shall be indicated. (Schematics and sketches may be rough as long as they are to scale and describe the proposed development accurately and sufficiently well to allow review and discussion.)

#### Preliminary Review

Preliminary review involves the substantive analysis of a project's compliance with all applicable City architectural guidelines and development standards. Fundamental design issues such as precise size of all built elements, site plan, elevations and landscaping are resolved at this stage of review. The DRB will identify to the applicant those aspects of the project that are not in compliance with applicable architectural guidelines and development standards and the findings that the DRB is required to make.

## Design Review Board Agenda

July 13, 2010

Page 16 of 18

Preliminary approval of the project's design is the point in the process at which an appeal of DRB's decision can be made. Preliminary approval of the project's design is deemed a basis to proceed with working drawings, following the close of the appeal period and absent the filing of an appeal.

Information required for preliminary review, in addition to the information required for conceptual review, includes:

- a. Complete site plan showing all existing structures, proposed improvements, proposed grading, including cut and fill calculations, lot coverage statistics (i.e., building, paving, usable open space and landscape areas), vicinity map, and topography.
- b. Floor plans and roof plans (1/8" scale minimum).
- c. All elevations (1/8" scale minimum) with heights, materials and colors specified.
- d. Preliminary landscape plan, when required, showing existing and proposed trees and shrubs, including any existing vegetation to be removed. This landscape plan shall also include all retaining and freestanding walls, fences, gates and gateposts and proposed paving and should specify proposed materials and colors of all these items.
- e. Site section for projects on slopes of 20 percent or greater, and when required by the DRB.

### Final Review

Final review confirms that the working drawings are in conformance with the project that received preliminary approval. In addition to reviewing site plan and elevations for conformance, building details and the landscape plan will be reviewed for acceptability.

Final review is conducted by the Planning and Environmental Services staff, in consultation with the DRB Chair or the Chair's designees. In the event that final plans are not in substantial conformance with the approved preliminary plans, the DRB Chair and Planning staff shall refer the matter to the full DRB for a final determination.

Information required for final review, in addition to the previous review requirements, includes:

- a. Complete set of architectural details, which must include window, eave & rake, chimney, railing and other pertinent architectural details, including building sections with finished floor, plate, and ridge heights indicated.
- b. 8 1/2" X 11" materials sample board of materials and colors to be used, as well as an indication of the materials and colors on the drawings. Sheet metal colors (for vents, exposed chimneys, flashing, etc.) shall also be indicated. All this information shall be included on the working drawings.
- c. Final site grading and drainage plan when required, including exact cut and fill calculations.
- d. Final landscape drawings, when required, showing the dripline of all trees and shrubs, and all wall, fence, and gate details. The drawings must show the size, name and location of plantings that will be visible from the street frontage, landscape screening which will integrate with the surrounding neighborhood, and irrigation for landscaping. Landscape drawings shall include a planting plan specifying layout of all plant materials, sizes, quantities and botanical and common names; and a final irrigation plan depicting layout and sizes of all equipment and components of a complete irrigation system (automated system required on commercial and multiple-residential developments). Planting and irrigation plans shall depict all site utilities, both above and below grade.

### Revised Final

Revised final review occurs when a substantial revision (e.g., grading, orientation, materials, height) to a project is proposed after final DRB approval has been granted. Plans submitted shall include all



## **Design Review Board Agenda**

July 13, 2010

Page 17 of 18

information on drawings that reflect the proposed revisions. If the revisions are not clearly delineated, they cannot be construed as approved.

### **Multiple Levels of Approval at a Single Meeting**

Planning staff may accept and process signs for two or more levels of DRB review (e.g., conceptual and preliminary) at a single meeting provided all required information is submitted and the project is properly noticed and agendized for such multiple levels of approval.

### **Presentation of Projects (Design Review Board Bylaws, 5.3)**

All levels of review with the exception of the consent agenda require the presentation of the project by the applicant or the applicant's representative. Items on the regular agenda that do not have a representative will be continued to a later hearing or removed from the agenda. The applicant or representative will be responsible for rescheduling the project if the project is removed from the agenda.

### **Public Testimony (Design Review Board Bylaws, 5.4)**

Members of the public attending a DRB meeting are encouraged to present testimony on agenda items. At the appropriate time, the DRB Chair will ask for public testimony, and will recognize those persons desiring to speak. A copy of any written statements read by a member of the public shall be given to the DRB Secretary. All speakers should provide all pertinent facts within their knowledge, including the reasons for their position. Testimony should relate to the design issues of the project and the findings upon which the DRB must base its decision. An interested party who cannot appear at a hearing may write a letter to the DRB indicating their support of or opposition to the project, including their reasoning and concerns. The letter will be included as a part of the public record.

### **Continuances, Postponements, and Absences (Design Review Board Bylaws, 5.5)**

A continuance is the carrying forward of an item to a future meeting. The applicant may request continuance of a project to a specified date if additional time is required to respond to comments or if they will be unable to attend the meeting. This is done either during the DRB meeting or by calling the DRB Secretary prior to the scheduled meeting so that the request may be discussed as part of the agenda status report at the beginning of the meeting.

### **Appeals (Design Review Board Bylaws, 5.8)**

#### **Sign Appeal Periods**

The **Final** or **Revised Final** approval or **denial** of a sign project by the DRB may be appealed. Any person withstanding may appeal a DRB decision to the City Planning Commission. An appeal application, a letter stating the reasons for the appeal, along with the appropriate fee, must be filed with Planning and Environmental Services within the ten (10) days following the final action. If the tenth day falls on a day that the Planning and Environmental Services offices are closed or closed early (such as on Fridays which close at 1:00 p.m.), the appeal period is extended until 5:30 p.m. on the following business day. Planning and Environmental Services will notify the DRB as to the scheduled date of the appeal hearing. The DRB will designate a member to attend an appeal hearing.

## Design Review Board Agenda

July 13, 2010

Page 18 of 18

### All Other Appeal Periods

The **Preliminary** or **Revised Final** approval or **denial** of a non-sign project by the DRB may be appealed. Any person withstanding may appeal a DRB decision to the City Planning Commission. An appeal application, a letter stating the reasons for the appeal, along with the appropriate fee, must be filed with Planning and Environmental Services within the ten (10) days following the final action. If the tenth day falls on a day that the Planning and Environmental Services offices are closed or closed early (such as on Fridays which close at 1:00 p.m.), the appeal period is extended until 5:30 p.m. on the following business day. Planning and Environmental Services will notify the DRB as to the scheduled date of the appeal hearing. The DRB will designate a member to attend an appeal hearing.